UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

STEELCASE, INC. a Michigan corporation,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 1:04cv0026 Hon. Robert Holmes Bell Chief, U. S. District Judge

٧

HARBIN'S INC., an Alabama corporation, MICHAEL G. HARBIN and HOPE D. HARBIN PATTERSON (now HOPE DUNCAN PATTERSON),

Defendants.

MILLER, JOHNSON, SNELL & CUMMISKEY, P. L. C. Jon G. March (P17065)
Attorneys for Plaintiff 250 Monroe Avenue, N. W. - Ste 800 P. O. Box 306
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0306 (616) 831-1700

HOPE D. PATTERSON Defendant in Pro Se 5626 Mill Race Court Atlanta, GA 30338 SILVERMAN, SMITH & RICE, P.C. Robert W. Smith (P31192) Attorneys for Defendant Michael G. Harbin 151 S. Rose Street 707 Comerica Building Kalamazoo, MI 49007 (269) 381-2090

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT MICHAEL G. HARBIN'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF STEELCASE, INC.'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM OF PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Defendant Michael G. Harbin ("Harbin") filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on April 29, 2005. Plaintiff Steelcase, Inc. ("Steelcase") filed a Motion for Partial Summary

Cascarae 5:04-008888 20-RHCSC Doboment 16060 File 6107/09/2902005 Page 2020 3

Judgment on April 29, 2005. Both parties requested oral argument. The Court scheduled

oral argument on those two motions for June 17, 2005.

On May 31, 2005, Steelcase filed its Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's

Claim of Piercing the Corporate Veil. Steelcase did not ask for oral argument on that

motion, and none was scheduled. Moreover, under Local Civil Rule 7.2(c) Harbin had 21

days after service of Steelcase's Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Claim of

Piercing the Corporate Veil within which to file a response brief. Harbin's response brief

was filed on June 28, 2005, well after the cross-motions for summary judgment were

argued. Local Civil Rule 7 contemplates that no argument will be scheduled until the

opposing party has had an opportunity to respond to the motion. Accordingly, considering

Steelcase's Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Claim of Piercing the Corporate

Veil, without giving Harbin a chance to respond in writing would have been improper. Any

oral argument prior to Harbin having had his opportunity to respond would also have been

improper.

Harbin's response to Steelcase's Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Claim

of Piercing the Corporate Veil was filed on June 28, 2005. Steelcase's Reply Brief in

Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Claim of Piercing the Corporate

Veil ("Steelcase's Reply Brief") was filed on July 13, 2005, 15 days later, in direct

contravention of Local Civil Rule 7.2(c) which requires that reply briefs be filed within 14

days after service of the response brief. Steelcase's Reply Brief is impertinent and should

be stricken under Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(f).

Steelcase, Inc. v Michael G. Harbin, et. al.

Case No.: 1:04cv00026

Cascaze05:04-0088889240-RHCSC Dobomente116060 Filectile7/09/29025005Pagreage083of 3

In the event that this Court chooses to deny Harbin's Motion to Strike Steelcase's

Reply Brief as untimely, alternatively, Harbin requests this Court to strike the section of

Steelcase's Reply Brief entitled "Procedural Status of the Motion" for the reason that

Steelcase's Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's Claim of Piercing the Corporate

Veil was not properly before the Court on July 12, 2005, the deadline for Steelcase's ability

to file a reply brief. Local Civil Rule 7.2(d) indicates that the court may schedule oral

argument or dispose of the motion without argument only at the end of the briefing

scheduling. The briefing schedule is now complete. Any reference to an oral argument

made prior to the end of the briefing schedule should be stricken as impertinent.

2.0 CONCLUSION

Steelcase's Reply Brief is untimely and should be stricken. Alternatively, at least the

section of Steelcase's Reply Brief entitled "Procedural Status of the Motion" should be

stricken for the reasons set forth above.

Dated: July 19, 2005

SILVERMAN, SMITH & RICE, P.C.

Attorneys for Defendant Michael G. Harbin

Case No.: 1:04cv00026

/s/ Robert W. Smith

Robert W. Smith (P31192)

Steelcase, Inc. v Michael G. Harbin, et. al.